Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_83559**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Design and Molecular Docking Studies of 1H-Benzo[b][1,5]diazepine-2(3H)-one Derivatives**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Authors have addressed the molecular modelling of the1,5 benzodiazepaines derivatives and docking against to GABA-A receptor associated protein (1KJT), but the purpose, significance and objectives were not clearly stated. Title of the manuscript needs revision. Introduction is poor and lacking the very purpose and objectives of the study. Discussion is very poor and conformers confirmed based on the lowest binding energy and docking scores are not supported with other studies in order to validate their conformity. Further there are no details on the conformers of ligands and their validation selected for docking against to receptor associated protein (1KJT) in the Results and discussion section. The dock scores calculated for Clobazam, Lofendazam are given in the Results and Discussion section of the manuscript. There are few references (Serial Nos. 7,8 and 9) are not cited in the text. Either they should be deleted from the reference section or they should be cited in the text.** **There are many shortcomings in the manuscript. Some corrections I have done in the manuscript in track change mode with comments on shortcomings, which should be communicated to authors for correction and improvement.** **There are many grammatical mistakes in the manuscript and complete manuscript seems to be poor in English and needs improvement. There is no conclusion section in the manuscript should be included.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ajey Kumar Pathak**
Department, University & Country	**ICAR- National Bureau of Fish Genetic Resources, India**